

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

KIM WOLPERT, . . . . .  
Plaintiff, . . . . .  
v. . . . .  
ABBOTT LABORATORIES, . . . . .  
Defendant. . . . .

**JURY VERDICT FORM**

We the unanimous Jury find as follows:

1. Do you find that plaintiff Kim Wolpert has proved that it is more likely than not that Abbott's decisionmaker knew that Kim Wolpert was pregnant when Abbott decided not to hire her?

YES: ✓ NO: \_\_\_\_\_

[If your answer is YES, please proceed to Question 2. If your answer is NO, please proceed to Question 3.]

2. Do you find that plaintiff Kim Wolpert has proved that it is more likely than not that defendant Abbott Laboratories engaged in intentional discrimination by failing to hire plaintiff for the coronary territory manager position because of plaintiff's pregnancy?

YES: ✓ NO: \_\_\_\_\_

**Proceed to Question 3**

3. Do you find that plaintiff Kim Wolpert has proved that it is more likely than not that defendant Abbott Laboratories engaged in intentional discrimination by failing to hire plaintiff for the coronary territory manager position because of plaintiff's gender?

YES: \_\_\_\_\_ NO: ✓

[If your answer to either Question 2 or Question 3 (or both) is YES, please proceed to Question 4. Otherwise, cease deliberations and return your verdict.]

4. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Plaintiff Kim Wolpert should be awarded back pay to compensate her for lost income because of the intentional gender or pregnancy discrimination at Abbott?

YES: ✓ NO: \_\_\_\_\_

If "YES," in what amount?

Answer: \$ 381,537 .00

**Proceed to Question 5**

5. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Plaintiff Kim Wolpert should be awarded damages to compensate her for emotional distress because of the intentional gender or pregnancy discrimination at Abbott?

YES: \_\_\_\_\_ NO: ✓

If "YES," in what amount?

Answer: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

[Cease deliberations.]

5/24/2012  
Date